

REMARKS

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-4 and 6-30 are allowable over the prior art. However, regarding claim 27, the Examiner stated:

The specification is objected to as failing to proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 27 contains the term “machine-readable medium.” The term “machine-readable medium” is not defined in the specification. Applicant should define this term such that it covers only hardware computer storage mediums.

Claim 27 has been amended to recite “computer-readable medium,” and not “machine-readable medium.” However, in consideration of the Examiner’s request that the term “machine-readable medium” be defined, the Applicant has defined the term “computer-readable medium” to include “memory and storage.” As indicated by the below portions of the specification, this definition is fully supported.

“The processor 12 executes instructions contained in the object code 22. The instructions can include memory access instructions such as instructions to read from the memory 14 and instructions to write to the memory 14. In some computer architectures, a memory access instruction has the capability of accessing a selectable numbers of bytes.” P. 2, lines 5-10.

The specification also describes storage as part of the system:

“In one example, the compiler 18 reads source code in a source code file on a storage device, such as a hard disk.” P. 2, lines 1-3.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 and the other claims (1-4, 6-26, and 28-30) are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner’s earliest convenience.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable. Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant : Bo Huang et al.
Serial No. : 10/718,283
Filed : November 19, 2003
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-886001 / P17581

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any required fees to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:May 6, 2008

/Denis G. Maloney/

Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21917270.doc